



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,865	11/02/2000	Agus Fanar Syukri	047912/0133 -	2288

22428 7590 04/05/2004

FOLEY AND LARDNER  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER
----------

LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/703,865

pp4  
Applicant(s)

SYUKRI, AGUS FANAR

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garner et al.(hereafter "Garner") [U.S. Pat. No. 5475737] in view of Matsuo [U.S. Pat. No. 6374246].

4. As to claims 1, 3 and 5, Garner teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: an e-mail system including a plurality of clients and call-forwarding service having capability of checking the status of a mailbox in response to an incoming call, wherein the address of the mailbox is extracted from the incoming phone call, and uses the ring count as a function of the status of the mailbox (e.g., accept the call within a predetermined interval or ring count if the mailbox has new message and indicating no

new message) [See e.g., Abstract; Fig.2; col.1, lines 6-28; note that in accordance with Garner's teaching the measurement of a predetermined ring count is equivalent to a predetermined time interval].

In matching up the address with the mailbox identifications, there is, by default, a lookup process examining through a plurality of mailboxes identifications and its associated statuses, which may obviously take the form of a table. Garner does not specifically teach organizing the table according to the incoming mail check frequency.

However, official notice is taken that such practice is well known in the art, in particular using caching technique to store frequently accessed information in a cache. Additionally, Matsuo teaches that the frequency of access to a message server having an e-mail account of the recipient may be used as a criterion for the address sorting [Matsuo: col.7, lines 11-19].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Garner and Matsuo by ranking Garner's mailbox ID table in accordance with the frequency of mailbox checking and store the frequently accessed records in a cache because by doing so it would facilitate the retrieval of mailbox status.

5. As to claims 2, 4 and 6, Garner does not specifically teach that the clients have a dial response decision unit for checking the aforementioned server's response.

However, official notice is taken that smart telephone set as described is well known in that art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have

used a smart telephone to distinguish different ring count or time latency at the switching stage of connecting to a called destination. In a sense, the decision flow chart of Garner's Fig.2 (except for stage S28) could obviously be implemented at the client's end, because such an automatic decision device would release the client from holding the telephone set throughout the mail checking process.

6. As to claims 9-14, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-6, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

7. Claims 7-8 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garner et al.(hereafter "Garner") [U.S. Pat. No. 5475737], as applied to claims 1-6 and 9-14 above and Matsuo [U.S. Pat. No. 6374246], as applied to claims 1-6 and 9-14 above, further in view of Fujiki [U.S. Pat. No. 6304896].

8. Fujiki is extracted from Applicant's IDS.

9. As to claims 7-8 and 15-16, Garner in view of Matsuo does not specifically teach using an ISDN sub-address transmitted along with a client's call to identify the caller. However, official notice is taken that using an ISDN sub-address to identify a caller is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ISDN sub-address because when the telephone

is connected via a ISDN line, the ISDN sub-address could naturally be used as an identification of the calling client.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Forin [U.S. Pat. No. 6360220].

**11.** A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Application/Control Number: 09/703,865

Page 6

Art Unit: 2783

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

April 1, 2004

*Wen-Tai Lin*  
4/1/04